

S U M M A R Y M I N U T E S

Eugene District Bureau of Land Management
Resource Advisory Committee
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000

March 14, 2002
Siuslaw Conference Room – Eugene District Office

A quorum of all categories of members was present.

Criteria and a process for choosing project proposals were discussed and set.

Presentations were received regarding non-BLM sponsored project proposals. A roundtable discussion of all proposals was held.

Project proposals were recommended for funding, as follows:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>	
Leopold Creek Culverts	\$129,300	
Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving	\$388,500	
Goodpasture Culvert	\$293,800	
Cottage Grove/Big River Stream Crossings	\$110,600	
Abandoned Car Removal	\$12,000	
Cottage Grove/Big River Stream Channel Enhancement		\$37,300
Scotch Broom Inventory	\$65,000	
Juvenile Forest Work Team	\$154,700	
Lane County Forest Work Camp	\$210,300	
Estimated BLM Indirect Cost @ 10%	\$140,000	
Estimated RAC Operating Cost	\$20,000	

It was recommended that the unused balance be carried over for use in Fiscal Year 2003.

The May 23 meeting was cancelled and a new meeting was scheduled for July 25.

M I N U T E S

Eugene District Bureau of Land Management
Resource Advisory Committee
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000

March 14, 2002
Siuslaw Conference Room – Eugene District Office

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Category 1: Judy Fitzgerald, Peter Hackett, Ross Mickey, Joanell Mogstad, and Steve Woodard

Category 2: Edward Alverson, James Baker, Penny Lind, and James Thrailkill

Category 3: Bud Hinman, Jamon Kent, John Lindsey, Anna Morrison, and June Olson

ALTERNATES PRESENT:

Category 1: David Schmidt

Category 2: None

Category 3: Philip Barnhart

-

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Category 1: None

Category 2: Robert Keefer

Category 3: None

ALTERNATES ABSENT:

Category 1: None

Category 2: James Fairchild, Linda Susan Kelly

Category 3: William Dwyer

OTHERS PRESENT:

Wayne Elliott (Designated Federal Official), Julia Dougan (Eugene District Manager), Rick Colvin, Wade Fraser, Bill Gilmore, Melanie Gisler, James Hallberg, Claire Hubler, Keli Kuykendall, Richard Lowary, Glenn Miller, Leo Poole, Phillip Reddinger, Jerry Richeson, Gerald Russell, Pat Russell, Jay Ruegger, Kris Ward, Mark Wilkening, Dennis Wise, and Nancy Wogan

OPENING, MINUTES APPROVAL AND AGENDA REVIEW

Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliot called the meeting of the Eugene District Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) for the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (the Act) to order at 9:15 a.m. He announced that Member Robert Keefer had asked to be excused from the meeting.

Eugene District Manager Julia Dougan welcomed members to the district office and said she and other staff members would be available to the committee during the meeting.

Chairperson James Baker noted that discussion of funding options would be added to the printed agenda of the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Elliott stated that the RAC Charter required accurate minutes of meetings to be kept and that they be approved. He noted that minutes of the previous meeting had been distributed with the agenda of the meeting.

Member Ross Mickey requested that future minutes include a summary listing of “follow-up items.”

Member Peter Hackett moved, seconded by Member Bud Hinman, to approve the minutes of the February 28, 2002, meeting of the Eugene District Resource Advisory Committee. The motion was adopted unanimously, 14:0.

Facilitator Mark Wilkening reviewed the agenda of the meeting.

Member Jamon Kent stated that he would be required to leave the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

DECISION CRITERIA

Mr. Elliott distributed copies of a document entitled “Internal BLM Project Criteria.” He reviewed information it contained regarding requirements for use of the Act project funds, as follows:

- At least 50 percent shall be used for projects dedicated to:
 1. Road maintenance, decommissioning, or obliteration
 2. Restoration of streams and watersheds
- Projects may include:
 3. Road, trail and infrastructure maintenance or obliteration

4. Soil productivity improvement
5. Improvements in forest ecosystem health
6. Watershed restoration and maintenance
7. Restoration, maintenance and improvement of wildlife and improvement of wildlife and fish habitat
8. Control of noxious and exotic weeds
9. Reestablishment of native species

Mr. Elliott said Title II projects were required to meet the purposes of the Act, benefit resources on or near federal lands, and be in compliance with existing BLM land use planning documents and all other Federal laws and regulations.

Mr. Elliott stated that BLM staff had found it difficult to provide a prioritization of project applications for fiscal year 2001-02, as requested by members at the February RAC meeting. He said groupings of projects had been prioritized in a list included in the distributed document, as follows:

1. Correct culverts that prevent fish passage or cause excessive sedimentation to streams and/or decommission unneeded or problem roads.
2. Initiate projects which add in-stream habitat improvement in order to increase aquatic habitat complexity.
3. Improve ecological function of riparian habitat and wetlands.
4. Develop a native seed supply for our restoration needs.
5. Projects which improve water quality in Clean Water Act Section 303d listed sub-basin.

Mr. Mickey said he believed a criterion should be set which referred to cost saving efficiencies, getting the maximum amount of good from available resources.

Mr. Mickey said he had learned that BLM had agreed that the 50 percent of Title II project funds required by the Act to be used for roads, streams and watersheds would be calculated on a regional basis, not the allocations of a single RAC.

Member Joanell Mogstad said she believed it would be possible to combine proposed projects when funding possibilities were being determined. Mr. Elliott said he agreed that there was connectivity between many projects.

Alternate Member David Schmidt reported that Salem and Willamette/Mt. Hood River RACs had agreed on a limited number of criteria to jumpstart their approval processes, as follows:

1. Likely to be approved by counties.

2. Possible to evaluate measurable results within 18 months.
3. Projects are ready to begin.

Member Anna Morrison stated that the Siuslaw RAC had set criteria, as follows

1. Ready for bid in May or June.
2. Ready to begin by July.
3. Be able to be physically demonstrated on the ground.
4. Visible, tangible results.

Member John Lindsey said he believed criteria set by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) were a “bottomless pit.”

Ms. Morrison suggested that if project applications submitted by non-BLM agencies needed to have NEPA evaluations completed, suggestions of resources for funding of them should be provided, or agencies permitted to complete the requirements themselves.

Member Penny Lind said she would appreciate having the sources of other funding being used in a project identified in its application.

Mr. Elliott noted that a spreadsheet included in a document entitled “FY 2002 Title II Proposed Project” distributed at the previous meeting of the RAC identified the status of NEPA requirements for each proposed project. He said it was his understanding that only one proposed project had not yet completed the requirements.

Ms. Morrison said it had been the experience of the Siuslaw RAC that it was important for project sponsors to be made aware that funding for multi-year projects was only guaranteed for one fiscal year. She said county commissioners could change the division of Title II and Title III funds each year, affecting the resources available for projects.

Member Steve Woodard said he would appreciate if information regarding the cost of completing NEPA requirements was included with data about projects in the previously distributed spreadsheet.

Mr. Kent suggested that provision be made for giving priority to multi-year projects funded for one year since not doing so could make projects with high initial costs inefficient.

Mr. Mickey said he believed it was possible to schedule the costs of fulfilling NEPA requirements and engineering over a project’s entire life, avoiding having them all come in its first year.

Mr. Schmidt said he also believed advantage should be taken of investments made in a project.

Ms. Mogstad asked if funding for a project had to be fully expended in the year for which it was granted. Mr. Elliot replied that current regulations stated that both funding and NEPA environmental analyses were valid for as long as a project took to be completed.

Member James Thrailkill suggested that criteria of the Act be used for choosing what projects to fund, and that “filters” be added for refinements. He said examples of such filters were if the project was efficient, had NEPA requirements completed, had measurable outcomes, and anticipated resources for future year developments.

Ms. Dougan reminded members that the expense of upfront planning and completing NEPA requirements had been covered by BLM for the project applications which were submitted for fiscal year 2002. She said applications for future years would likely include re-imbursement for such expenses. She said that if the costs were not reimbursed, the project proposals would likely be withdrawn.

Mr. Lindsey pointed out that some NEPA-related expenses were required of BLM projects, but not of private sector projects.

Member Edward Alverson said he believed it would be beneficial to have a variety of projects funded, including all types identified in the Act, although it was not necessary that such variety be a criterion for project selection.

Mr. Mickey said he was interested in getting the most done with available funds, irrespective of whether all types of projects were included. He said types of projects identified in the Act were permissive not mandatory.

Mr. Alverson said he believed community interests should be reflected in the projects chosen.

Mr. Mickey said he did not want the RAC to be forced to return funding allocated for fiscal year 2002, but that approximately \$600,000 of project proposals would need to be eliminated. He proposed that members initially recommend approval for projects for which there was consensus and then discuss additional projects to support.

Mr. Wilkening recorded suggestions for project application selections made by members, as follows:

Criteria for Choosing Projects

1. Maximum amount of good on the ground. Finance efficiency.

2. Connection between projects.
3. Funding by category.
4. Measurable results within 18 months – physically measurable.
5. Ready to go. NEPA complete

FUNDING OPTIONS

Mr. Wilkening posted a chart of funding options prepared by BLM staff, as follows:

Funding Options

1. Approve all projects in excess of Title II funding level . . . result would be to use FY03 decision space.
2. Drop projects to balance with FY02 funds (within ten percent).
3. Pro-rate all projects to balance with FY02 funds (affects the viability of some projects).

Mr. Elliott explained that Option 1 suggested that all proposed projects be approved and that those which were not able to be funded be supported with Fiscal Year 2003 resources. He said Option 2 involved elimination of projects that did not meet agreed upon criteria and Option 3 divided available resources proportionally among all projects.

Mr. Schmidt suggested an additional alternative was to recommend proposed projects to each county on the basis of the county's contribution to the available resources. He said other RACs had followed such an option with subcommittees representing the counties preparing the recommendations.

Ms. Morrison reported that the Siuslaw RAC had followed a similar option.

Chairperson Baker suggested that members develop recommendations which gave attention to the location of proposed projects, irrespective of whether doing so became an officially adopted criterion.

Mr. Elliott pointed out that only one proposed project was located in Douglas County. Ms. Dougan added that several proposed projects would have district-wide effect.

Ms. Lind said she believed funds should be distributed to proposed projects according to their source.

Mr. Alverson said he believed it was important for members representing areas outside Lane County to be satisfied with recommendations. He suggested that since such areas were limited, it would be more effective to evaluate the appropriateness of the distribution of the resources over several years.

Ms. Lind said she appreciated the suggestion of Mr. Alverson.

Chairperson Baker suggested that the proposal of Mr. Alverson would allow a county to benefit from projects costing more than its contribution to the total resources.

Ms. Morrison suggested that it was possible for a project that was not approved to be funded if it was re-proposed in a subsequent year.

Mr. Alverson suggested that if a project was not approved, it could be recommended for it to be re-proposed with certain modifications.

Mr. Mickey said he did not support Funding Option proposals #1 and #3 because they left the public out of the decision making process.

Ms. Lind said she agreed with Mr. Mickey.

Member Judy Fitzgerald said she would support Funding Option proposal #2 if it allowed for elimination of certain elements of a project proposal.

Ms. Morrison moved, seconded by Mr. Kent, that project proposals be recommended for Fiscal Year 2002 by eliminating enough projects for the cost of the remainder to equal the balance (within ten percent) of the resources available.

Mr. Lindsey asked if the motion would require members to vote by category. Ms. Dougan replied that the RAC Charter only required such voting on recommendations for project approval.

Mr. Mickey said he would prefer that all available funds not be obligated in project recommendations, but that the motion be restated to eliminate projects until the cost of the remainder was “within” the balance available.

Ms. Morrison said she was concerned about the ten percent overhead cost identified in the motion. She said the true cost of projects should be paid, but that it needed to be identified for each project.

Ms. Morrison withdrew her motion. Mr. Kent withdrew his second.

BLM Staff Bill Gilmore stated that the intention of the reference to ten percent in the Funding Option proposal was to allow for under estimation of costs by project bidders. He added that funds not expended from Fiscal Year 2002 resources would automatically be “rolled over” and be available in Fiscal Year 2003.

Members discussed the merits of spending and not spending all available resources.

Ms. Morrison moved, seconded by Mr. Mickey, that recommendations for funding of project proposals for Fiscal Year 2002 be made on the basis of criteria developed, eliminating enough projects for the cost of the remainder to be within the balance of the resources available. The motion was adopted unanimously, 14:0.

Members took a ten minute break from the agenda of the meeting at 10:40 a.m.

PRESENTATION OF PROJECTS RECEIVED FROM THE PUBLIC

Native Seed Network

Keli Kuykendall stated that she was Director of the Institute for Applied Ecology, sponsor of the Native Seed Network project proposal for which the application had been distributed at the previous meeting of the RAC. She said she was a field biologist with 15 years of experience in Oregon.

Ms. Kuykendall explained that the goal of the Native Seed Network was to develop economical sources of local native plant materials by coordinating demand, production and research, while maintaining the genetic and functional integrity of existing ecosystems. She said the project would provide coordination between government agencies, seed growers, researchers, and consumers of native seed and plant materials. She said it would develop a network for the collection, propagation and marketing of native plants; increase market predictability; avoid over-collection of existing populations; and establish a seed transfer zone demonstration project for Roemer’s fescue, providing breeder seed to area farmers.

Ms. Kuykendall said the network would use an “eco-region approach” with technology available through the World Wide Web of the Internet and be a valuable tool for concerned parties throughout the Willamette Basin. She said application for Title II funding of the project had been made to each of the RACs in the area involved. She said such funding was appropriate because the primary consumer of the service would be federal agencies.

Mr. Schmidt asked how the Native Seed Network would relate to other similar efforts. Ms. Kuykendall replied that the project would subsume the seed certification service of Oregon State

University and similar programs. She noted that a letter of support from the certification service was included with the project application.

Mr. Schmidt asked if the project would be implemented if grants were not received from all of the RACs in the region. Ms. Kuykendall distributed copies of two documents entitled “Eugene District Title II Project” and explained that they included data about allocation of the cost of the project to five BLM RACs, the project’s budget, and how the budget was calculated.

Mr. Kent asked what other funding sources were available to the project. Ms. Kuykendall replied that development of the computer software to be used was funded by a federal grant and that other resources would make partial implementation of the project possible. She said other funding sources could also be approached.

Mr. Lindsey said he was concerned that the proposed project would duplicate work already being done. He said he was aware that growers currently used existing systems to accomplish the goals and objectives of the project. He said existing seed warehouses and the Oregon State University Extension Service were performing most of the functions proposed for the project.

Ms. Kuykendall said the experience of Mr. Lindsey contradicted her own. She said there was much contention about what constituted a native species in Oregon and that many growers produced hybrid seeds. She explained that the Native Seed Network would deal with native species only.

Mr. Lindsey stated that his previous experience with seed growing projects suggested that the proposed project would create a complicating layer of bureaucracy.

Ms. Morrison said that she shared the concerns of Mr. Lindsey. She asked how long the Native Seed Network had been in existence. Ms. Kuykendall replied that the project was not yet operational. She explained that the concept had been developed in 2000, that writing of software had begun October 2001, and that the system would be up and running in May 2002.

Ms. Morrison asked if Title II resources would be the primary funding source for the project. Ms. Kuykendall replied that a five-year grant from the Department of Interior was in place, that foundation grants were being sought, that cooperative work with the Nature Conservatory had begun, and that conversations with Senator Ron Wyden’s office had indicated that there was much interest in funding native plant species projects.

Ms. Morrison said Lane County was using native seed on roadway right-of-way projects. Ms. Kuykendall replied that the projects used seed developed for specific locations.

Ms. Morrison asked if funding from other RACs had been approved. Ms. Kuykendall replied that she was not aware of any decisions made regarding Native Seed Network applications.

Mr. Lindsey said his conversations with growers indicated that seeds being used were already certified which indicated that an inventory process was already in existence. Ms. Kuykendall replied that the proposed project would provide a mechanism to document seed certifications and manage its distribution processes.

Mr. Alverson asked how many plant species would optimally be involved in a Willamette Basin restoration project and how many were available. Ms. Kuykendall replied that of the 36 desirable species, only two were available commercially and that those were not based on local genetics.

Oregon BLM Staff Jim Halberg stated that the Eugene District RAC was only the third in the state to reach the stage of being ready to recommend Fiscal Year 2002 Title II projects. He said the Roseburg RAC had not yet made any decisions and the Coos Bay RAC had completed its recommendations.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS

Invasive Species Control and Inventory – Scotch Broom Inventory (Remote Sensing Project)

BLM Staff Nancy Wogen distributed copies of a document entitled “Remote Sensed Scotch Broom Inventory” and reviewed information it contained about the project. She said the project would contract with a non-federal party to produce a map that would identify the distribution and abundance of Scotch Broom throughout the District. She said the data produced would be put into Geographic Information System (GIS) format and be available to track infestation and treatment areas for several plant species.

Ms. Wogen explained that the project was for three years. She said if the project was not funded with Title II resources, the District would piece together a system for recording and evaluating Scotch Broom infestation with BLM internal workforce.

BLM Staff Jay Ruegger distributed copies of a draft aerial photograph map of Scotch Broom Bloom and described the development and use of such tools in the proposed project.

In response to a question from Mr. Mickey, Ms. Wogen reviewed the benefits of the project, as follows:

- To identify and prioritize control projects for Scotch Broom infestation

- To identify and develop logical partnerships for controlling Scotch Broom and other Invasive Plant species in key areas.
- To serve as a “base” map layer for future weed inventory data to be spatially mapped.
- To provide an automated system to track infestations and control treatments and monitor their effectiveness.
- To provide compliance with BLM Directives regarding Invasive Plant species.

Mr. Kent asked what resources were available for abatement of Invasive Plants identified by the proposed project. Ms. Wogen replied that abatement was currently funded using fire suppression resources and Forest Work Camp crews. She said application had been made for Title III funding of abatement work.

Mr. Schmidt asked why it was necessary to use GIS coordinates for weed control work. Mr. Ruegger replied that the use of aerial photography alone was a time consuming and rigorous task. He said GIS mapping would greatly increase the efficiency of such work.

Mr. Hinman asked if it was important to get precise map coordinates without a good eradication program. He also asked if the project would overlap with similar work done by the Oregon Department of Agriculture. Ms. Wogen replied that the BLM cooperated with the Oregon Department on eradication work. She said experience had shown that cutting Scotch Broom and re-seeding cleared areas with native species was a successful eradication method.

Mr. Alverson asked how much of the information to be provided by the proposed project was currently available. Ms. Wogen replied that the BLM currently had no mapping tools for weed eradication. She said the project would identify the most important areas for the work.

Mr. Mickey said he did not believe Scotch Broom would ever be eradicated, but that the project would be successful if it reduced the likelihood of its spread.

Mr. Woodard said he believed eradication of small infestations of Scotch Broom was important and asked if such areas would be identified by the proposed project. Ms. Wogen replied that eradication efforts would be concentrated on currently uninfected areas. Mr. Ruegger added that plants in bloom as small as one meter in diameter would appear on the aerial photographs.

Member June Olson asked if there would be other uses for the aerial photographs of the District produced by the project. Mr. Ruegger replied that there were other BLM uses for which the maps would be used and that the photographs would be made available to the public for the cost of reproduction.

Ms. Olson asked if the project would produce measurable results when its objective was only to improve detection, not eradication. Ms. Wogen replied that BLM would continue its Invasive Plant control measures and that the tool produced by the project would guide the effort.

PRESENTATION OF PROJECTS RECEIVED FROM THE PUBLIC (Continued)

Willamette Basin Weed Coordination

Willamette Restoration Initiative Program Manager Dennis Wise said the Willamette Basin Weed Coordination project was been developed by his organization. He referred to documents describing work of the initiative available for members – “The Willamette Restoration Strategy – Overview,” “Willamette Restoration Strategy – CD-ROM,” and “Selected Noxious Weeds of Oregon.”

Mr. Wise described development of the proposed project. He said state and federal agency coordination was needed to quantify invasive species, educate the public, and work with landowners to control harmful populations. He said the project would begin the funding of a coordinator for the Oregon Noxious Weed Project.

Mr. Lindsey asked how the proposed project differed from the work of watershed councils and other groups. Mr. Wise replied that it would provide coordination of the work of others and be the only effort covering the entire Willamette Basin. He said watershed councils worked with smaller areas and that the proposed project would provide coordination for work with multiple issues among many councils.

Mr. Mickey asked what geographic area would be served by the project and what would be its “deliverables.” Mr. Wise replied that the project would serve the Willamette Basin and include private, State of Oregon, BLM, and National Forest Service land in Benton, Clackamas, Columbia, Marion, Multnomah, Lane, Linn, Polk, Washington, and Yamhill counties. He said pursuit of funding resources, partnerships within the covered areas, and a steering committee to develop a plan to prevent the introduction and control the spread of harmful Invasive Plant species were the project’s goals.

Mr. Alverson said he supported the proposed project because the Oregon Department of Agriculture had no staff working on noxious weeds, no agency was currently providing protection activities, and a work plan could benefit public and private landowners.

Ms. Morrison asked Mr. Alverson if he was associated with the Willamette River Initiative. Mr. Alverson replied that he was not, but that he would likely be in conversation with the proposed coordinator.

Mr. Lindsey asked why more that water shed coordination was needed for weed control. He said it appeared to be a proposal to create additional paperwork.

Ms. Lind said she did not believe the Umpqua Watershed Council on which she served could take on additional responsibilities for coordination of weed control.

Ms. Morrison suggested that continued funding for the proposed project be included in its goals. She said it needed a concrete and measurable accomplishment to qualify for Title II re-funding.

Alternate Member Phillip Barnhart suggested that the proposed project should be conducted on a region-wide basis. He said he questioned if one RAC should be solely responsible for funding it. Mr. Wise replied that RAC investment would be multiplied by the efforts of counties which were required to develop operational plans for weed infestation abatement.

Chairperson Baker said he agreed that watershed councils were overloaded with work, without the addition of weed eradication. Mr. Wise replied that weed eradication needed to become part of the ecological concern of councils.

Mr. Lindsey said he was concerned that the proposed project would give preference to regional control over local control.

Mr. Thrailkill said weeds were a concern of the entire region, not a single local area.

Mr. Wise said the proposed project would be presented to other RACs and other funding agencies. He said it would take a creative approach to finding continued funding.

Members took a fifteen minute break from the agenda of the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS (Continued)

Native Seed Collection and Growout

Ms. Wogen distributed copies of a document entitled “Native Seed Growout Project” and reviewed information it contained. She said the proposed project would fund continued development of the Eugene District’s supply of upland seed mix for restoration projects on federal land. She said the request was based on the unanticipated availability of native species seed from a BLM contractor-grower and would comply with Directives for development of a native Seed Program.

In response to questions, Ms. Wogen explained that the purchase was not included in the District budget; that the amount requested could be reduced as described in the distributed document; that the seed would be used for road decommissioning, culvert pulls, weed replacement; that the seed was of a native species and had unknown forage value for grazing wildlife, and that the seed did not contain any Invasive Species.

Culvert Replacement and Road Maintenance

Ms. Morrison asked if the Leopold Creek Culvert Replacement Project was ready to proceed. BLM Staff Leo Poole replied that its design was nearly complete. BLM Staff Phillip Reddinger added that contracts for projects awarded by October 1 were considered to be funded by resources of the previous fiscal year. Ms. Dougan said the project would meet all procurement deadlines.

Ms. Mogstad said she had requested maps for culvert replacement and road maintenance projects. Mr. Reddinger distributed copies of maps entitled "Leopold Creek Culverts."

Chairperson Baker asked if the Goodpasture Road Culvert Replacement Project was related to a timber sale. Mr. Elliott replied that it was not. Mr. Reddinger distributed copies of a packet of material which he said contained additional information and maps for the Goodpasture Road Culvert Replacement and McKenzie Road Decommissioning projects.

Ms. Morrison asked if the Hult Pond Area Road Improvement project was ready to proceed. Mr. Reddinger replied that it would be ready to proceed to procurement in May and be completed by summer.

Ms. Morrison asked if it would be possible to complete Phase I of the project in Fiscal Year 2002. Mr. Reddinger replied that the time required for the work would extend the time needed for its completion to a second construction season.

Mr. Alverson asked how the costs of the project were distributed. Mr. Reddinger replied that the majority of its expense was for culvert construction.

Chairperson Baker asked if the project had taken increased traffic flow into account. Mr. Reddinger replied that he believed additional traffic would be caused by increases in recreational use of the area and population growth, not an improved road surface.

Mr. Mickey said he believed pricing of the project could be broken into elements, instead of phases, and allow calculation of single-year funding.

Ms. Morrison said she gave priority to the Hult Pond Area Road Improvement project, especially its Prairie Mountain section.

Mr. Mickey said he preferred to spend resources on projects that could be completed within a single year, not to allocate funds for projects which would continue over many years.

Mr. Barnhart asked who would do the work on the Hult Pond Area project. Mr. Reddinger replied that the work would be done by a local contractor with inspection by BLM staff.

Members discussed the phasing of projects.

BLM Staff Glenn Miller distributed copies of material which included a description of the Tyrrell Seed Orchard Access Road Paving project and maps of its locations. Mr. Alverson noted that the cost of the project had been reduced from what was initially described. Mr. Miller said the reduction had resulted from refinement of the project, but that the project itself had not been changed.

Forest Work Camp and Department of Youth Services Programs

Terry Smith stated that he represented Lane County and was prepared to discuss the Forest Work Camp and Department of Youth Services project proposals.

Mr. Barnhart asked why labor costs differed in the projects. Mr. Smith replied that it was possible to consider Juvenile program labor as court imposed community service.

Mr. Barnhart asked if the proposed project would reduce matrix jail releases in Lane County. Mr. Smith said the project would allow expansion of the Forest Work Camp to its capacity of 120 beds and thereby reduce crowding and early releases from the jail.

Mr. Kent asked if Forest Work Camp participants could be involved in BLM weed eradication projects. Mr. Smith replied that participants were available at an hourly rate of \$4.48 for unskilled hand labor and that a significant portion of work currently done was on BLM land.

Mr. Smith distributed copies of diagrams showing a breakdown of the funding and expenses for the Forest Work Camp and Juvenile Community Service programs. He explained the information they contained.

Chairperson Baker asked why the cost of the programs was double for the second year of their operation. Mr. Smith replied that first year costs were for less than a year.

Chairperson Baker asked if the Juvenile program anticipated competition from the Northwest Youth Corps or privately operated programs. Mr. Smith replied that the program was for low-level offenders and was proven effective. He said the proposals would create good paying jobs for new Sheriff's Deputies.

Mr. Mickey asked why the Forest Work Camp operation was not entirely funded by Title III resources. Mr. Smith replied that the Act was complicated by political compromise and its language was misleading and confusing. He said the safest way to ensure correct use of it would be to seek funds for materials and supplies costs from Title II resources. Ms. Morrison added that it would be impossible to operate the Forest Work Camp at full capacity without Title II resources.

Forest Road Decommissioning

Mr. Lindsey asked for an explanation of the difference between road decommissioning and road obliteration. BLM Staff Jerry Richeson replied that obliteration involved a great deal more than blocking access as in decommissioning.

Ms. Mogstad asked if any roads involved in the decommissioning projects had been built with Oregon and California (O&C) land grant resources. Mr. Richeson replied that it was his understanding that most roads of the type involved in the proposed projects had been built with resources from timber sales.

Ms. Lind asked if it would be possible to complete the Big River Spur Road Decommissioning in the 2002 construction season. BLM Staff Rick Colvin replied that it would be possible. He explained that decommissioning involved breaking the subsoil and compaction of a roadway, blocking access to it, removing its culverts, and dropping trees across it. He distributed copies of a document which provided a project cost analysis for the proposed project and maps of its location.

Mr. Hinman asked if it would be possible to simply plant trees in roadways to decommission a road. Mr. Colvin replied that trees would not easily grow in compacted roadways. He said it was anticipated that natural seeding would take place after a roadway was broken up.

Ms. Mogstad said she appreciated that maps were being distributed for proposed projects, but they were of little use without recognizable points of reference.

Chairperson Baker asked if the McKenzie Road Decommissioning project could be completed in the 2002 construction season. BLM Staff Kris Ward replied that that it would be completed if funding was provided.

In-Stream Fisheries Habitat Enhancement and Student Conservation Association Volunteer Program

Mr. Colvin distributed copies of maps of the Big River In-Stream Log and Boulder Placement project. He described the project.

Ms. Mogstad asked if Forest Work Camp inmates could participate in the project. Mr. Colvin replied that it was unlikely that they could because all of the work involved operation of heavy equipment.

Mr. Hinman asked how the Student Conservation Association Volunteer Program was monitored. Mr. Colvin replied that the students were trained, monitored, and evaluated by BLM fish biologists.

Mr. Woodard asked if it would be possible to anchor trees with steel cable in the Big River project. Mr. Wilkening replied that any use of metal in streams contaminated the water.

Mr. Lindsey asked who was responsible for the collection of data in BLM fish habitat inventories. Mr. Poole replied that data was collected by students and verified by BLM fish biologists. He said training of the students was essential and that the biologists were responsible for the quality of their work.

Mr. Elliott said the BLM had many years of experience using Student Conservation Association students in its inventory work. He said the data produced were excellent and it was a good use of available resources.

Mr. Poole described a fish species survey.

Mr. Kent asked if it would be possible for high school students to participate in the inventory work. Mr. Poole replied that such students would require more supervision than was available. Mr. Wilkening added that BLM used high school students in other projects.

Chairperson Baker asked how participants were chosen for habitat inventories. Mr. Poole replied that a description of the type and number of persons needed was sent to the Student Conservation Association which then provided lists of applicants and their qualifications. He said BLM representatives chose participants.

Mr. Lindsey asked if the proposed project was an appropriate use of Title II resources. Mr. Gilmore said such programs were within the guidelines for use of the funds. Mr. Elliott said BLM considered the resources a valuable alternative funding source for the program.

Mr. Lindsey said that the Northwest Wildlife Plan had resources to pay for data collection. Mr. Elliott replied that the funds were designated for monitoring timber sales.

Mr. Alverson asked how the data collection of the proposed project would increase fish populations. Mr. Poole replied that the surveys would determine if corrective measures were effective. He said the information assisted in management decisions.

Mr. Alverson asked if student-gathered data was acceptable to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Mr. Poole replied that it was. Mr. Elliott added that standards for data gathering were the same in the BLM and all federal and state agencies.

Mr. Lindsey said it was important that fish data be collected in an accurate and scientific manner because of the significant impacts endangered species regulations.

Mr. Hackett asked for an explanation of the type of research in which the data gathered would be used. Mr. Poole replied that students would simply be gathering information as part of pre- and post-project surveys.

Native Seed Network (Continued)

Ms. Kuykendall stated that high interest had been expressed in the Native Seed network project by organizations involved in the work.

Mr. Schmidt asked if consideration had been given to ways to get the proposed project completed with fewer personnel. Ms. Kuykendall replied that the budget for the project had been built on data management and technical startup cost standards. She said ways to make the project more economical were constantly being evaluated.

Mr. Lindsey asked why already existing information such as maps was not proposed to be used in the project. Ms. Kuykendall replied that maps to be created would be built on new data.

Members asked questions regarding specific costs of the project.

Mr. Lindsey asked who was ultimately responsible for the Native Seed Network project. Ms. Kuykendall replied that the project was sponsored by an Oregon nonprofit corporation recognized by the Internal Revenue Service. She said costs of personnel for the project were comparable to similar other work, there was a board of directors which was responsible for its operation, and a Certified Public Accountant performed an annual audit of its financial affairs.

Mr. Lindsey and Mr. Hinman requested copies of a list of the members of the Native Seed network Board of Directors.

Mr. Kent left the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Members took a ten minute break from the agenda of the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

PUBLIC FORUM

Chairperson Baker determined that there was no one present wishing to address the RAC.

Ms. Mogstad requested consideration of funding the registration fee for her to attend the National Committee Meeting in Reno, NV. Chairperson Baker, Mr. Lindsey, and Ms. Morrison stated that they were already scheduled to attend.

Mr. Lindsey said he did not believe it was appropriate to use the public funds of the Act to support attendance of a member at a meeting of an organization which sought to influence legislation related to concerns of the RAC.

Chairperson Baker determined there was consensus to not consider the request of Ms. Mogstad.

PROJECT LIST APPROVAL

Members discussed various methods to reach a decision on recommending projects for approval.

Chairperson Baker determined there was consensus to (1) consider requests for all proposed projects, (2) allow members to identify projects for individual consideration, and (3) approve recommending funding for those projects which were not identified for individual consideration in a single vote.

Chairperson Baker invited members to identify projects for individual consideration from applications for Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 Title II funds, as follows:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Leopold Creek Culverts	\$129,300
Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving	\$388,500
Goodpasture Culvert	\$293,800
Cottage Grove/Big River Stream Crossings	\$110,600
Tyrrell Seed Orchard Access Road Paving	\$98,000
Big River Spur Road Decommissioning	\$39,400

McKenzie Road Decommissioning	\$85,000	
Abandoned Car Removal	\$12,000	
Cottage Grove/Big River Stream Channel Enhancement		\$37,300
Student Conservation Association	\$81,000	
Scotch Broom Inventory	\$65,000	
Native Seed Collection	\$80,000	
Willamette Basin Weed Partnership	\$26,800	
Native Seed Network	\$112,100	
Juvenile Forest Work Team	\$154,700	
Lane County Forest Work Camp	\$210,300	
Estimated BLM Indirect Cost @ 10%	\$140,000	
Estimated RAC Operating Cost	<u>\$20,000</u>	
	\$2,084,000	

Ms. Mogstad requested that individual consideration be given to the Native Seed Network proposed project.

Ms. Morrison requested that individual consideration be given to the Willamette Basin Weed Partnership proposed project.

Mr. Mickey requested that individual consideration be given to the Student Conservation Association proposed project.

Ms. Mogstad requested that individual consideration be given to the Native Seed Collection proposed project.

Ms. Mogstad requested that individual consideration be given to the McKenzie Road Decommissioning proposed project.

Ms. Morrison requested that individual consideration be given to the Tyrrell Seed Orchard Access Road Paving proposed project.

Chairperson Baker requested that individual consideration be given to the Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving proposed project.

Mr. Mickey requested that individual consideration be given to the Big River Spur Road Decommissioning proposed project.

Mr. Mickey requested that individual consideration be given to the Abandoned Care proposed project.

Ms. Olson requested that individual consideration be given to the Scotch Broom Inventory proposed project.

Mr. Mickey requested that individual consideration be given to the Cottage Grove/Big River Stream Crossings proposed project.

Mr. Mickey moved, seconded by Ms. Fitzgerald, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for Title II projects, as follows:

<i>Leopold Creek Culverts</i>	<i>\$129,300</i>
<i>Goodpasture Culvert</i>	<i>\$293,800</i>
<i>Cottage Grove/Big River</i>	
<i>Stream Channel Enhancement</i>	<i>\$37,300</i>
<i>Juvenile Forest Work Team</i>	<i>\$154,700</i>
<i>Lane County Forest Work Camp</i>	<i>\$210,300</i>
<i>Estimated BLM Indirect Cost @ 10%</i>	<i>\$140,000</i>
<i>Estimated RAC Operating Cost</i>	<i><u>\$20,000</u></i>
	<i>\$985,000</i>

Ms. Morrison noted that the cost of the project recommended for approval located in Douglas County was more than the contribution of the county to the available funds.

Ms. Morrison asked if funds were available for Consumer Price Index inflation rates on approved projects. Mr. Gilmore stated that inflation factors were not considered until the second year of the program.

Ms. Morrison noted that the amount proposed for BLM Indirect Costs should be adjusted to relate to the actual total allocated for projects.

The motion was adopted unanimously, 13:0, with members voting as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i><u>Category One</u></i>			
Judy Fitzgerald	X		
Peter Hackett	X		

Ross Mickey	X		
Joanell Mogstad	X		
Steve Woodard	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>	
<u><i>Category Two</i></u>			
Edward Alverson	X		
James Baker	X		
Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind	X		
James Thrailkill	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<u><i>Category Three</i></u>			
Bud Hinman	X		
Jamon Kent			X
John Lindsey	X		
Anna Morrison	X		
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>

Members began discussing proposed projects for which individual consideration had been requested.

Mr. Alverson proposed that members caucus in member categories to create prioritized lists of projects to be supported.

Chairperson Baker determined there was consensus to adopt the proposal of Mr. Alverson.

Members took a ten minute break from the agenda of the meeting to caucus in member categories.

Mr. Mickey reported that Category One members had had prioritized the remaining proposed projects for Fiscal Year 2002 Title II funding, as follows:

Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving	\$150,500
Tyrrell Seed Orchard Access Road Paving	\$98,000
Cottage Grove/Big River Stream Crossings	\$110,600
Native Seed Collection	\$80,000
Abandoned Car Removal	\$12,000

Chairperson Baker reported that Category Two members had had prioritized the remaining proposed projects for Fiscal Year 2002 Title II funding, as follows:

Scotch Broom Inventory	\$65,000
McKenzie Road Decommissioning	\$85,000
Abandoned Car Removal	\$12,000

Ms. Morrison reported that Category Three members had prioritized the remaining proposed projects for Fiscal Year 2002 Title II funding, as follows:

Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving	\$388,500
Tyrrell Seed Orchard Access Road Paving	\$98,000
Cottage Grove/Big River Stream Crossings	\$110,600
Abandoned Car Removal	\$12,000

Mr. Hackett moved, seconded by Ms. Fitzgerald, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve \$12,000 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the Abandoned Car project. The motion was adopted unanimously, 13:0, with members voting as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<u>Category One</u>			
Judy Fitzgerald	X		
Peter Hackett	X		
Ross Mickey	X		

Joanell Mogstad	X		
Steve Woodard	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>	
<u>Category Two</u>			
Edward Alverson	X		
James Baker	X		
Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind	X		
James Thrailkill	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<u>Category Three</u>			
Bud Hinman	X		
Jamon Kent			X
John Lindsey	X		
Anna Morrison	X		
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>

Mr. Hackett moved, seconded by Ms. Morrison, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve \$388,500 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving project. The motion was defeated with three Category Two members voting in the negative as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>
--	------------	-----------	---------------

<u>Category One</u>			
Judy Fitzgerald	X		
Peter Hackett	X		
Ross Mickey	X		
Joanell Mogstad	X		
Steve Woodard	X		
<i>Total:</i>	5	0	
<u>Category Two</u>			
Edward Alverson	X		
James Baker		X	
Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind		X	
James Thrailkill		X	
<i>Total:</i>	1	3	1
<u>Category Three</u>			
Bud Hinman	X		
Jamon Kent			X
John Lindsey	X		
Anna Morrison	X		
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	4	0	1
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	10	3	2

Mr. Alverson moved, seconded by Mr. Hackett, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve \$65,000 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools

and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the Scotch Broom Inventory project. The motion was defeated with four Category One and four Category Three members voting in the negative as follows:

	Yes	No	<i>Absent</i>
<u>Category One</u>			
Judy Fitzgerald		X	
Peter Hackett	X		
Ross Mickey		X	
Joanell Mogstad		X	
Steve Woodard		X	
<i>Total:</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>4</i>	
<u>Category Two</u>			
Edward Alverson	X		
James Baker	X		
Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind	X		
James Thrailkill	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<u>Category Three</u>			
Bud Hinman		X	
Jamon Kent			X
John Lindsey		X	
Anna Morrison		X	
June Olson		X	
<i>Total:</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>

<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>2</i>
------------------------------	----------	----------	----------

Mr. Mickey moved, seconded by Mr. Woodard, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve \$98,000 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the Tyrrell Seed Orchard Access Road Paving project. The motion was defeated with two Category One, four Category Two, and one Category Three members voting in the negative as follows:

	Yes	No	Absent
<u>Category One</u>			
Judy Fitzgerald		X	
Peter Hackett		X	
Ross Mickey	X		
Joanell Mogstad	X		
Steve Woodard	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	
<u>Category Two</u>			
Edward Alverson		X	
James Baker		X	
Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind		X	
James Thrailkill		X	
<i>Total:</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>
<u>Category Three</u>			
Bud Hinman	X		
Jamon Kent			X

John Lindsey	X		
Anna Morrison		X	
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>2</i>

Mr. Lindsey moved, seconded by Mr. Hackett, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve \$110,600 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the Cottage Grove/Big River Stream Crossings project. The motion was adopted unanimously, 13:0, with members voting as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<u><i>Category One</i></u>			
Judy Fitzgerald	X		
Peter Hackett	X		
Ross Mickey	X		
Joanell Mogstad	X		
Steve Woodard	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>	
<u><i>Category Two</i></u>			
Edward Alverson	X		
James Baker	X		
Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind	X		
James Thrailkill	X		

<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<u><i>Category Three</i></u>			
Bud Hinman	X		
Jamon Kent			X
John Lindsey	X		
Anna Morrison	X		
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>

Mr. Mickey moved, seconded by Mr. Woodard, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve \$85,000 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the McKenzie Road Decommissioning project. The motion was defeated with two Category One and three Category Three members voting in the negative as follows:

	Yes	No	<i>Absent</i>
<u><i>Category One</i></u>			
Judy Fitzgerald	X		
Peter Hackett	X		
Ross Mickey		X	
Joanell Mogstad		X	
Steve Woodard	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	
<u><i>Category Two</i></u>			
Edward Alverson	X		
James Baker	X		

Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind	X		
James Thrailkill	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<u>Category Three</u>			
Bud Hinman		X	
Jamon Kent			X
John Lindsey		X	
Anna Morrison		X	
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>2</i>

Mr. Alverson moved, seconded by Mr. Thrailkill, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve (1) \$388,500 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving project and (2) \$85,000 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the McKenzie Road Decommissioning project.

Mr. Lindsey observed that the Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving project required a large amount of funds. Chairperson Baker added that recommending first year funding for the project implied making a commitment to continue recommending funding in future years. Ms. Morrison noted that the project would replace 26 culverts.

Mr. Hackett asked what funding would be proposed for the Hult Pond Paving project in Fiscal Year 2003. BLM Staff Gerald Russell replied that it was likely \$238,000 would be required.

Chairperson Baker said he believed there would be more “bang for the buck” with the McKenzie Road Decommissioning project than other proposed decommissionings.

Mr. Woodard suggested that the Scotch Broom Inventory project be substituted for the road de-commissioning project.

Mr. Alverson said he believed both projects were worthy of consideration, but that to postpone the Scotch Broom Inventory project for a year would exacerbate the problem it was intended to address.

The motion was defeated with three Category One and one Category Three members voting in the negative as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<u><i>Category One</i></u>			
Judy Fitzgerald	<i>X</i>		
Peter Hackett	<i>X</i>		
Ross Mickey		<i>X</i>	
Joanell Mogstad		<i>X</i>	
Steve Woodard		<i>X</i>	
<i>Total:</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	
<u><i>Category Two</i></u>			
Edward Alverson	<i>X</i>		
James Baker	<i>X</i>		
Robert Keefer			<i>X</i>
Penny Lind	<i>X</i>		
James Thrailkill	<i>X</i>		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<u><i>Category Three</i></u>			
Bud Hinman	<i>X</i>		
Jamon Kent			<i>X</i>
John Lindsey		<i>X</i>	

Anna Morrison	X		
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>

Mr. Alverson moved, seconded by Mr. Thrailkill, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve \$388,500 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the Hult Pond Road Chip Seal Paving project. The motion was adopted unanimously, 13:0, with members voting as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<u><i>Category One</i></u>			
Judy Fitzgerald	X		
Peter Hackett	X		
Ross Mickey	X		
Joanell Mogstad	X		
Steve Woodard	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>	
<u><i>Category Two</i></u>			
Edward Alverson	X		
James Baker	X		
Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind	X		
James Thrailkill	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<u><i>Category Three</i></u>			

Bud Hinman	X		
Jamon Kent			X
John Lindsey	X		
Anna Morrison	X		
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>

Mr. Lindsey moved, seconded by Mr. Mickey, that the Eugene to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, to approve \$65,000 of Title II Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for the Scotch Broom Inventory project. The motion was adopted unanimously, 13:0, with members voting as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<u><i>Category One</i></u>			
Judy Fitzgerald	X		
Peter Hackett	X		
Ross Mickey	X		
Joanell Mogstad	X		
Steve Woodard	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>	
<u><i>Category Two</i></u>			
Edward Alverson	X		
James Baker	X		
Robert Keefer			X
Penny Lind	X		

James Thrailkill	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<u>Category Three</u>			
Bud Hinman	X		
Jamon Kent			X
John Lindsey	X		
Anna Morrison	X		
June Olson	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>

Mr. Mickey moved, seconded by Ms. Morrison, to recommend to Designated Federal Official Wayne Elliott that a request be made to U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton, or her designee, that the balance of unused Fiscal Year 2002 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 funding for Title II projects be carried over for use in Fiscal year 2003. The motion was adopted, 12:1, with members voting as follows:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<u>Category One</u>			
<i>Judy Fitzgerald</i>	X		
<i>Peter Hackett</i>	X		
<i>Ross Mickey</i>	X		
<i>Joanell Mogstad</i>	X		
<i>Steve Woodard</i>	X		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>	
<u>Category Two</u>			
<i>Edward Alverson</i>	X		

<i>James Baker</i>	<i>X</i>		
<i>Robert Keefer</i>			<i>X</i>
<i>Penny Lind</i>		<i>X</i>	
<i>James Thrailkill</i>	<i>X</i>		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<u><i>Category Three</i></u>			
<i>Bud Hinman</i>	<i>X</i>		
<i>Jamon Kent</i>			<i>X</i>
<i>John Lindsey</i>	<i>X</i>		
<i>Anna Morrison</i>	<i>X</i>		
<i>June Olson</i>	<i>X</i>		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Total All Categories:</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>

Mr. Alverson said he believed non-BLM groups were at a disadvantage in submitting applications for Title II funds. He suggested that they be provided assistance and feedback in the application process.

Mr. Wilkening said staff would be more able to offer assistance to applicants having had the experience of the current process.

Mr. Elliott stated that the Fiscal Year 2003 Request for Proposals for the use of Title II funds would be issued soon.

Mr. Alverson suggested that a question be added to the application form to show a group's accountability.

Ms. Morrison said additional information could help RAC members have more comfort with agency partnering.

Mr. Wilkening requested feedback on whether field trips would improve recommendation decision making.

Ms. Dougan requested feedback on how to present Fiscal year 2003 project proposals.

Ms. Morrison suggested that additional time be allowed to review and deliberate on proposals.

Mr. Schmidt said the Mt. Hood and Salem RACs were not intending to complete their recommendation process until August.

Chairperson Baker said he also preferred additional time for the process.

Ms. Morrison asked if it would be possible to receive project proposals for fire suppression. Ms. Dougan said she would investigate the potential of developing such a proposal.

Ms. Morrison asked that project proposals related to recreation, such as trail maintenance, and to noxious weed elimination be developed.

Chairperson Baker suggested that stream enhancement project proposals also be developed.

Chairperson Baker determined there was consensus to cancel the RAC meeting scheduled for May 23 and to schedule a meeting on July 25.

Chairperson Baker stated that the location of the RAC meeting previously scheduled for June 13 would be announced when it was determined.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)

**Follow-Up Items From
March 14, 2002, RAC Meeting**

1. Include a list of follow-up items with meeting minutes.
2. Require listing of sources of non-BLM funding being used in a project proposal.
3. Include the cost of completing NEPA requirements with data about project proposals.
4. Provide a list of the members of the Native Seed Network Board of Directors.
5. Add a question to project application form to show a group's accountability.
6. Provide information about project partners in proposal information.
7. Allow additional time for review and deliberation on project proposals.
8. Encourage submission of project proposals for fire suppression, recreation, noxious weed elimination, and stream enhancement.
9. Schedule locations for June 13 and July 25 RAC meetings.